

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,141	05/18/2005	Kunihiko Tokura		2774
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK			EXAMINER	
			OLSEN, ALLAN W	
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MC	ONTHS	01/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<
	10/521,141	TOKURA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Allan Olsen	1763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	OATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 J	lanuary 2005.		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa			
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	.•
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) 2 and 4-8 is/are pending in the applic	cation.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8 is/are withdrawn	from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2,4 and 5</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) <u>6-8</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.		
Application Papers		·	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2006 is/	′are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[objected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	,		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	4- hava haan saabaad		
1. Certified copies of the priority documen		polication No.	
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documen3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority			
application from the International Burea	•	received in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 2)	_	s)/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/13/2006</u> .	6) Other:		

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claim 6-8 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed (claims 2 and 4) for the following reasons: The inventions of claim 6 and claim 4 are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination of claim 4 has separate utility such as in the direct fabrication of a final product rather than in the making of an intermediate mold. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 6-8 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to

Art Unit: 1763

provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Drawings

The replacement drawing sheet, (sheet 1 of 3) was received on September 26, 2006. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claim 4 recites, "causing a pattern formed on said photomask to be arranged onto said die". The "arranged" aspect of this limitation is not fully understood. Does simply placing the photomask onto the surface of the die constitute the arranging of a pattern, or must the pattern be transferred into the surface of the die?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1763

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,985,116 issued to Mettler et al. (hereinafter, Mettler).

Mettler teaches pre-shaping a photoresist to the shape of the object that is to be etched by vacuum molding the resist over a mold. With respect to the limitation of claim 2, Mettler teaches the mask molding process comprises annealing. See: abstract; figure 2; column 2, line 14 - column 4, line 15.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 07-319146.

JP 07-319146 teaches using heat to molding a photoresist mask to the three dimensional contours of an object to be etched. See abstract.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mettler.

Mettler does not teach forming a speaker diaphragm.

Art Unit: 1763

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that Mettler's teaching pertaining to the fabrication of a conformal photomask, may be applied to impart a surface structure to any three dimensional object.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the applied references do not teach a method for "decorating a surface of a die usable for forming a three-dimensional object by a molding process", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art method produced a structure that is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1763

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allan Olsen whose telephone number is 571-272-1441. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W and F: 1-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Allan Olsen Primary Examiner Art Unit 1763